

1 **WAGSTAFF LAW FIRM**  
 2 Sommer D. Luther, CO BAR #35053  
 3 940 Lincoln Street  
 4 Denver, CO 80203  
 5 Tel: (720) 208-9417  
 6 Fax: (303) 376-6361  
 7 sluther@wagstafflawfirm.com

8 *Attorney for Plaintiff*

9  
 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 11  
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 13  
 14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
 15  
 16

17 IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
 18 PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT  
 19 LITIGATION

20 This Document Relates to:

21 K.C. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No.  
 22 3:25-cv-05720-CRB

23 Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

24 **PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO  
 25 DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES,  
 26 INC., RASIER, LLC, AND RASIER-CA,  
 27 LLC'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASES FOR  
 28 FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT  
 ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer  
 Courtroom: 6 – 17<sup>th</sup> Floor

18 **I. INTRODUCTION**

19 On September 26, 2025, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss cases of Plaintiffs who did not file  
 20 a Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”) in connection with Pretrial Order (“PTO”) 10. (Doc. 3493). Counsel  
 21 acknowledges and understands that under PTO 10, the Court created procedures and deadlines to  
 22 produce a PFS. Counsel has and continues to diligently comply with discovery obligations. Plaintiffs  
 23 can become unavailable for a variety of reasons during litigation, especially when said Plaintiff is the  
 24 survivor of a sexual assault.

25 Counsel continues to make diligent efforts to obtain a completed Plaintiff Fact Sheet (“PFS”)  
 26 from Plaintiff K.C. The client has historically been responsive; however, communication has recently

1 become intermittent. Counsel last successfully communicated with Plaintiff last month regarding the  
 2 PFS, at which time Plaintiff expressed a clear intention to comply with Court procedures and deadlines.  
 3 Since that communication, Plaintiff's current telephone number has been disconnected, preventing  
 4 further contact. Counsel will continue to make reasonable and diligent efforts to reestablish  
 5 communication with Plaintiff to facilitate the completion and submission of her PFS.  
 6

7

8 **II. ARGUMENT**

9 *a. The Court should deny Uber's Motion to Dismiss as procedurally improper.*

10 Rule 37 supplies the Court with a panoply of options for dealing with discovery disputes. Within  
 11 that rubric, dismissal – let alone dismiss with prejudice – is the most “drastic sanction” that due process  
 12 reserves for “non-compliance...due to willfulness, fault or bad faith” alone. *Signalo v. Mendoza*, 642  
 13 F.2d 309, 310 (9th Circ. 1981). Uber has not even tried to make the requisite showing of “flagrant  
 14 disregard” here, which dooms their motion and the bespoke procedure it envisions. *Id.* (citation  
 15 omitted). Uber could have developed an appropriate record in support of its position had it followed  
 16 proper procedure and sought an Order to Show Cause. Instead, Defendants prematurely filed the present  
 17 motion, which must therefore be denied.

18

19

20 *b. The Court should not dismiss this case with prejudice.*

21

22 In the event the Court is inclined to grant Uber's Motion to Dismiss, it cannot dismiss with  
 23 prejudice in this context. Dismissing with prejudice goes against the *Malone* factors as discussed by  
 24 Uber and other Plaintiffs' firms in response to the Motion to Dismiss. Here, Plaintiffs state the quiet out  
 25 loud: dismissing with prejudice is premature as these are survivors of sexual assault speaking out against  
 26 one of the largest corporations on the planet. While the appropriate safeguards to discovery must be  
 27 followed for the truth-seeking process, the practical reality is that these humans have suffered grave  
 28

1 harm but are not part of the current bellwether trial. There is no real prejudice to Uber that warrants  
2 dismissal with prejudice. Meanwhile, the process of producing a PFS is a multifaceted task that requires  
3 a survivor to confront their traumatizing experience head on and it is often uncomfortable and  
4 overwhelming. Counsel will continue its efforts with Plaintiff K.C. to produce their PFS.

5

6

7 **III. CONCLUSION**

8 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request this Court DENY Uber's Motion to  
9 Dismiss as procedurally improper. In the alternative, counsel requests the Plaintiff K.C. not be dismissed  
10 with prejudice.

11

12 Dated: October 10, 2025

13 Respectfully submitted,

14 */s/ Sommer D. Luther*  
15 **WAGSTAFF LAW FIRM**  
16 Sommer D. Luther, CO 35053  
17 940 Lincoln Street  
18 Denver, CO 80203  
19 Tel: (720) 208-9417  
20 Fax: (303) 376-6361  
21 sluther@wagstafflawfirm.com  
22 Attorney for Plaintiff

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on October 10, 2025, I electronically filed the following with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing via electronic mail to all counsel of record as maintained in the CM/ECF electronic system.

Dated: October 10, 2025

/s/ Sommer D. Luther  
**WAGSTAFF LAW FIRM**  
Sommer D. Luther, CO 35053  
940 Lincoln Street  
Denver, CO 80203  
Tel: (720) 208-9417  
Fax: (303) 376-6361  
[sluther@wagstafflawfirm.com](mailto:sluther@wagstafflawfirm.com)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*



1 **MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY**

mshortnacy@shb.com

2 **CHRISTOPHER C. COTTON**

ccotton@shb.com

3 *Attorneys for Defendants – UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC*

4  
5 **[X] BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION ONLY:** By emailing the document(s) to the persons at  
6 the email address(es) listed above. No electronic message or other indication that the transmission  
7 was unsuccessful was received within a reasonable time after the transmission.

8 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and  
9 correct.

10 Executed October 10, 2025 in Denver, Colorado.

11 /s/ Theresa Fryan

12 Theresa Fryan

13 Paralegal

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28